

> Elmendorf has been using the WAWF-RA system since January 2002. I  
> think this is a great system and agree that electronic invoicing is  
> the only way to do business.

> 1. Manning. The field is not provided additional manning to  
> implement electronic invoicing. Again, we take it out of our hide and  
> do more work with less personnel. Even though the system is easy to  
> use once you learn how to use it, it is very time consuming to get to  
> that point. I spend 2-3 hours assisting contractors with training and  
> getting their computer ready to send an invoice. Then, I spend  
> another 1-2 hours on the phone with first time vendors. I spend  
> additional time training government personnel in contracting and  
> quality assurance on how to receive an electronic invoice. In  
> addition to training the government personnel, I have to obtain their  
> PKI's, load this info to their computers, fill out DISA Form 41's, and  
> track all this data.

> We can do this without additional manning as long as we have enough  
> time to implement.

> 2. If all new solicitations require electronic invoicing by 1 Oct 02  
> then we will have a huge influx vendors and government personnel not  
> knowing what to do. I am fortunate to have started this in Jan 02. I  
> recommend that new solicitations over 100K be implemented on 1 Oct 02  
> This will give us time to train all the right people on how to do  
> electronic invoicing. Solicitations under 100K should be phased in  
> over the next year.

> 3. Believe it or not some of our small businesses do not own a  
> computer. This may force them into progressing into the future or it  
> may deter them from doing business with the government.

> 4. On the flip side, our large businesses have their own intricate  
> method of invoicing that they are indicating to us there will be costs  
> for the government to pay for them to switch.

> 5. We do not have the travel funds to train our vendors in remote  
> Alaskan locations.

> 6. The proposed DFARS rule "permits the contracting officer to  
> authorize the contractor to use another electronic form, with the  
> concurrence of the payment office and the contract administration office."

> The proposed clause 252.232-7XXX Electronic Submission of Payment  
> Requests, para (c) states " If, after contract award, the Contractor  
> is unable to submit a payment request in electronic form, or the  
> Government is unable to receive a payment request in electronic form,  
> the Contractor shall submit the payment request using a method  
> mutually agreed to by the Contractor and the Contracting Officer."

> Do we need to include the payment office in the clause, as stated in  
> the proposed DFAR rule?

> Please contact me if you have any questions and need additional  
> comments. I really love this program!!!

> LESLIE A. KRAWCZYK  
> Quality Assurance Program Coordinator  
> Wide Area Work Flow Program Coordinator

> Comm: 907-552-7556  
> DSN: 317-552-7556  
> Fax: 907-552-3908  
> email: leslie.krawczyk@elmendorf.af.mil